



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,623	11/26/2003	Govind A. Kothandapani	60046.0064US01	4194
53377	7590	08/28/2006		
HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC P.O. BOX 2825 ATLANTA, GA 30301			EXAMINER LAI, VINCENT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/723,623	Applicant(s) KOTHANDAPANI ET AL.	
	Examiner Vincent Lai	Art Unit 2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 and 38-55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


FRITZ FLEMING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

8/23/2006

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/26/2003.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 11-37 in the reply filed on 3 July 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 26 November 2003 was considered by the examiner.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Configuring a Baseboard Management Controller Through a Graphical User-Interface for Use In a Computer System".

Claim Objections

4. Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities:

There are two periods after claim 36.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The limitation "comprises all industry-known components which may be communicatively connected to the management module" is exceedingly broad and ill defined. It is not stated as to how such a method can encompass all different configurations possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 11-16, and 20-21, 27-28, and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Super Micro Computer, Inc (IPMI View User Guide), herein known as Super Micro.

As per claim 11, Super Micro discloses a computer-implemented method for customizing a management module for use in monitoring operation of components included in a configuration specified for a baseboard of a computer system, the method comprising:

defining description files corresponding to a set of components which may be included in the configuration, wherein each component of the set is associated with a description file (See figure 2-3 on page 4: A new system may be added and thus a description would be necessary for software to recognize);

providing a graphical user interface for modeling the configuration specified for the baseboard (See figure 3-1 on page 8: The IPMI Domain subwindow will show the hierarchy of the system), wherein the user interacts with the graphical user interface to select one or more components included in the configuration (See figure 2-6 and 2-7 on page 6: Different systems can exist in the software and they can be joined or disjointed);

in response to user selection of one or more components on the graphical user interface, copying the device description file of each of the one or more selected components to a configuration file (See page 5: Reload configuration is possible); and

incorporating the configuration file into the management module such that the management module is programmed to receive information from the one or more selected components (See page 5: Saving configuration is possible).

As per claim 12, Super Micro discloses wherein each device description file comprises information for configuring the management module to receive information from an associated component (See page 6: Done with joining a group).

As per claim 13, Super Micro discloses wherein at least one device description file comprises information for configuring the management module to control an associated component based on the information received from the associated component (See page 6: Done with joining a group), the incorporating act further comprising:

incorporating the configuration file into the management module such that the management module is programmed to control the associated component (See page 5: This is inherently done when configuration is reloaded).

As per claim 14, Super Micro discloses wherein the set of components for which the description files are defined comprises all industry-known components which may be communicatively connected to the management module (See figure 2-4 on page 5: A new system can be defined).

As per claim 15, Super Micro discloses wherein the management module comprises a software module operable for implementation on the computer system (See figure 2-1 on page 3: GUI is the front end for control software).

As per claim 16, Super Micro discloses wherein the management module comprises a baseboard management controller (BMC) operable for being communicatively connected to the baseboard (See page 3: The System window lists managed computers with a BMC card).

As per claim 20, Super Micro discloses wherein the providing act comprises:
rendering on the graphical user interface a first portion comprising a plurality of graphical icons, wherein each of the plurality of graphical icons represent a component in the set of components which may be included in the configuration (See figure 3-1 on page 8: See section of group under IPMI Domain).

As per claim 21, Super Micro discloses wherein the providing act further comprises:

rendering on the graphical user interface a second portion for creating a model of the configuration of the baseboard using the plurality of graphical icons included in the first portion (See figure 3-1 on page 8: See section of group under IPMI Domain).

As per claim 27, Super Micro discloses a system for customizing a management module responsible for monitoring operation of one or more components in a specific configuration specified for a baseboard of a computer system, the system comprising:

a plurality of description files each describing a component in a set of components which may be included in the configuration (See figure 2-3 on page 4: A new system may be added and thus a description would be necessary for software to recognize);

a graphical user interface through which a user selects one or more components from the set of components for inclusion in a model being constructed based on the configuration (See figure 3-1 on page 8: The IPMI Domain subwindow will show the hierarchy of the system); and

means for incorporating each device description file corresponding to the one or more selected components into a configuration file operable for loading into the management module to provide the management module with an ability to receive information from the one or more selected components (See page 5: Saving configuration is possible).

As per claim 28, Super Micro discloses wherein the graphical user interface comprises:

a first portion comprising a plurality of graphical icons, wherein each of the plurality of graphical icons represent a component in the set of components which may

be included in the configuration (See figure 3-1 on page 8: See section of group under IPMI Domain); and

a second portion for creating the model using the plurality of graphical icons included in the first portion (See figure 3-1 on page 8: See section of group under IPMI Domain).

As per claim 32, Super Micro discloses wherein at least one of the device description files comprises information for configuring the management module to control an associated component based on the information received from the associated component (See figure 2-3 on page 4: A new system may be added and thus a description would be necessary for software to recognize).

As per claim 33, Super Micro discloses wherein the management module is a baseboard management controller (BMC) operable for being communicatively connected to the baseboard (Software is used in conjunction with a BMC).

As per claim 34, Super Micro discloses wherein the set of components comprises a sensor device (See page 3: Sensors are part of system).

As per claim 35, Super Micro discloses wherein the sensor device is selected from the group consisting of a temperature sensor, a voltage sensor and a tachometer (See figure 6-1).

As per claim 36, Super Micro discloses wherein the sensor device is a sensor aggregation component (See figure 6-1).

As per claim 37, Super Micro discloses wherein the configuration file is incorporated into Intelligent Platform Management Interface (IPMI)-compliant firmware loaded into the BMC (Software is called IPMI View).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 17-19, 22-26, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Super Micro Computer, Inc (IPMI View User Guide), herein known as Super Micro.

As per claim 17, Super Micro teaches further comprising:
receiving a command from the user through the graphical user interface selecting a first component (See page 4 and 5: Done with reloading configuration or adding new system).

Super Micro does not teach the use of pins.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the functionality of the BMC to include receiving a command from the user through the graphical user interface requesting a connection of the first component to a contact pin of the BMC. In figure 7-2, The BMC is shown, with pins connected. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the pins of the BMC can be used to send and receive data. It would have been a design choice in order to achieve limitations and such changes would not be detrimental to operation of such a device.

As per claim 18, Super Micro teaches a computer-implemented method as defined in claim 17.

Super Micro does not teach the use of pins.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the functionality of the BMC to include the step of analyzing the requested connection of the first component to the contact pin of the BMC in order to determine whether the first component is a component which may be appropriately connected to the contact pin. This is obvious since if the component and the BMC are not compatible then no functionality would be gained and thus it would render such a connection useless. In addition, if two devices were incompatible, then it would be obvious to have some sort of detection mechanism to detect such a case. If such mechanism was used, detection would have to be done via contact pins.

As per claim 19, Super Micro teaches a computer-implemented method as defined in claim 18, further comprising outputting an error signal (See second paragraph of SNMP section on page 18: Errors are broadcasted).

Super Micro does not teach presenting an error message on the graphical user interface if the analyzing act determines that the first component is not a component which may be appropriately connected to the contact pin.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the invention such that an error message would display on the GUI. Error messages are already broadcast and it would only make sense to be able to display such messages in the GUI that controls the BMC.

As per claim 22, Super Micro teaches a computer-implemented method as defined in claim 21.

Super Micro does not teach receiving a command from the user through the graphical user interface selecting a first component, wherein the user enters the command by dragging a first graphical icon representing the first component from the first portion into the second portion.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the invention in such a manner. Super Micro already discloses the changing of settings/commands with menus (See figures 4-1 and 7-1) and it would be obvious to implement such changes graphically, using icons to make the changing of settings/commands easier.

As per claim 23, Super Micro teaches a computer-implemented method as defined in claim 22.

Super Micro does not teach displaying on the second portion the first graphical icon in response to the user dragging the first graphical icon onto the second portion.

would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified to invention in such a manner. Super Micro already discloses the changing of settings/commands with menus (See figures 4-1 and 7-1) and it would be obvious to implement such changes graphically, using icons to make the changing of settings/commands easier.

As per claim 24, Super Micro teaches a computer-implemented method as defined in claim 23 and pins on a BMC (See figure 7-2).

Super Micro does not teach the use of pins and thus does not teach wherein the receiving act comprises: receiving a command from the user through the graphical user interface requesting a connection of the first component to a particular contact pin of a second component, wherein a second graphical icon representing the second component is already displayed on the second portion.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the invention to allow control of connections of pins. Connections can be made in software (See figure 2-6 and 2-7 on page 6:

Different systems can exist in the software and they can be joined or disjointed) and it would be obvious to be able to make these connections graphically.

As per claim 25, Super Micro teaches a computer-implemented method as defined in claim 24.

Super Micro does not teach the use of pins.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the functionality of the BMC to include receiving a command from the user through the graphical user interface requesting a connection of the first component to a contact pin of the BMC and the step of analyzing the requested connection of the first component to the contact pin of the BMC in order to determine whether the first component is a component which may be appropriately connected to the contact pin. In figure 7-2, The BMC is shown, with pins connected. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the pins of the BMC can be used to send and receive data. It would have been a design choice in order to achieve limitations and such changes would not be detrimental to operation of such a device. This is obvious since if the component and the BMC are not compatible then no functionality would be gained and thus it would render such a connection useless. In addition, if two devices were incompatible, then it would be obvious to have some sort of detection mechanism to detect such a case. If such mechanism were used, detection would have to be done via contact pins.

As per claim 26, Super Micro teaches a computer-implemented method as defined in claim 25, further comprising outputting an error signal (See second paragraph of SNMP section on page 18: Errors are broadcasted).

Super Micro does not teach presenting an error message on the graphical user interface if the analyzing act determines that the first component is not a component which may be appropriately connected to the contact pin.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the invention such that an error message would display on the GUI. Error messages are already broadcast and it would only make sense to be able to display such messages in the GUI that controls the BMC.

As per claim 29, Super Micro teaches a system as defined in claim 28.

Super Micro does not teach wherein the user selects the one or more components for inclusion in the model by dragging a first graphical icon representing the first component from the first portion into the second portion.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified to invention in such a manner. Super Micro already discloses the changing of settings/commands with menus (See figures 4-1 and 7-1) and it would be obvious to implement such changes graphically, using icons to make the changing of settings/commands easier.

As per claim 30, Super Micro teaches a system as defined in claim 29 and the ability to group systems (See page 6).

Super Micro does not teach wherein the graphical user interface enables the user to propose a connection between the first component and a second component by connecting the first graphical icon to a contact pin on the second component already displayed on the second portion.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified to invention in such a manner. Super Micro already discloses the changing of settings/commands with menus (See figures 4-1 and 7-1) and it would be obvious to implement such changes graphically, using icons to make the changing of settings/commands easier.

As per claim 31, Super Micro teaches a system as defined in claim 30.

Super Micro does not teach the use of pins.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the functionality of the BMC to include the step of analyzing the requested connection of the first component to the contact pin of the BMC in order to determine whether the first component is a component which may be appropriately connected to the contact pin. This is obvious since if the component and the BMC are not compatible then no functionality would be gained and thus it would render such a connection useless. In addition, if two devices were incompatible, then it

would be obvious to have some sort of detection mechanism to detect such a case. If such mechanism was used, detection would have to be done via contact pins.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patent and patent applications are cited to show further art related to configuring a baseboard management controller through a graphical user-interface for use in a computer system:

U.S. Patent Application Publication # US 2003/0101021 A1 to Shah et al shows an animation of a configuration diagram to visually indicate deployment of programs.

U.S. Patent Application Publication # US 2004/0177143 A1 to Maciel et al shows a system and method for managing data processing devices.

U.S. Patent # 6,948,008 B2 to Hawkins et al shows a system with redundant central management controllers.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent Lai whose telephone number is (571) 272-6749. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (First BiWeek Friday Off).


Art Unit: 2181

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fritz M. Fleming can be reached on (571) 272-4145. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vincent Lai
Examiner
Art Unit 2181

vi
August 23, 2006


FRITZ FLEMING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
8/23/2006